DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 404 848 FL 022 394

AUTHOR Dopke, S.; And Others
TITLE Psycholinguistic Aspects of Bilingualism.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 60p.; In: Bilingualism and Bilingual Education. NLIA Occasional Paper No. 2; see ED 355 759.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; *Bilingualism; Children; Cognitive Development; Comparative Analysis; Cultural Influences; Foreign Countries; *Individual Psychology; Language Acquisition; Language Attitudes; Language Research; Monolingualism; *Parent Child Relationship; Parent Influence; *Psycholinguistics; *Social Psychology
IDENTIFIERS Australia

ABSTRACT

This paper considers psycholinguistic aspects of bilingualism from two perspectives: the psychology of the individual and social psychology. The linguistic development of children is described and research is presented that compares bilingual and monolingual children with respect to cognitive development. The emotional consequences of parents' decision to speak or not to speak their own language with their children after they have arrived in a new country is discussed as well as social factors that influence the levels of proficiency that bilingual speakers attain. The future of bilingualism in Australia is a function of people's attitudes to languages and varieties of language; social identity theory frames the discussion of Australian research on language attitudes. Recommendations focus on encouraging bilingualism at the family and community levels. (JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 404 848

Psycholinguistic Aspects of Bilingualism

S. Döpke, T.F. McNamara and T.J. Quinn
Linguistics and Language Studies
University of Melbourne

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Athol
Yates
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Introduction

As a result of continuing large-scale immigration into Australia, bilingualism is an ever-clearer reality in Australia. To a society which has traditionally perceived itself as monolingual, accepting bilingualism as 'normal' and catering for the needs of bilingual families poses difficulties. To parents who are, for the first time in their lives, in a situation where their mother tongue is not the language of the society at large, deciding on the right course of action in relation to their children's upbringing produces a great deal of anxiety.

This paper will consider psycholinguistic aspects of bilingualism from two perspectives: the psychology of the individual and social psychology.

After a description of the linguistic development of bilingual children, we present research comparing bilingual and monolingual children with respect to cognitive development. Following that, the emotional importance of speaking the parents' language and reasons for bilingual children's relatively high rates of school failure will we discussed. The role of attitude and motivation in language maintenance and loss as well as in the acquisition of a second language will be discussed in the context of social identity theory. The paper will conclude with suggestions

FL 022 394

BEST COPY AVAIL

for recommendations.

Linguistic development

With respect to bilingual children's linguistic development, the following three questions appear to be most often asked by parents and educators:

- Do bilingual children acquire language at a slower rate than do monolingual children?
- Should we be worried about bilingual children's mixing of their two languages?
- Is the developmental path altered due to the dual language acquisition?

In the following, an answer to each of these three questions will be attempted.

Rate of language development in bilingual children: To date, few studies have looked directly into the rate of bilingual children's linguistic development and compared it to that of monolingual children. Doyle et al. (1978) asked mothers of thirteen children who were bilingual in English and French and thirteen mothers of monolingual children between the ages of 1;5 and 3;6 at what age their children uttered their first words. The groups were matched for dominant language, age, sex, status of their non-verbal development and socio-economic status of parents. The average age at which they uttered their first word was reported as 11.2 months for the bilingual group and 12.0 months for the monolingual group. The difficulties which mothers would have had with recalling their children's onset of speech can be assumed to have been the same for both groups of subjects. Hence, distorting or subjective factors are not likely to have biased one group more than the other. Extensive language testing of both groups showed that neither Taylor's (1974) speculations concerning bilingual children's slower development of higher order concepts nor Ben-Zeev's (1972) suggestion that bilingual children concentrate

more on the structural development of their two languages than on the lexical development could be supported . However, vocabulary development in the dominant language might be slightly delayed due to a relative lack of input in areas in which the second language is the medium of communication. This does not affect the total size of the bilingual child's vocabulary, which is usually comparable to, if not bigger than, that of monolingual children .

With respect to structural development, Swain (1972) argued that certain grammatical structures are delayed in bilingual children. Swain (1972) did a case study of question formation in two bilingual French-English subjects. The children were exposed to the two languages according to the principle of one parent-one language. The subjects ranged in age from 3;2 to 3;9 and 4;0 to 4;5, respectively. The results suggested that the formation of wh-questions might be delayed in bilingual children by a few months as compared with the development of monolingual children.

Padilla and Lindholm (1976) provided some counter-evidence to Swain (1972). They studied the development of interrogatives, negatives and possessives in the speech of nineteen bilingual Spanish-English children, ranging in age from 2;0 to 6;4. For each child a minimum of 400 utterances per language were recorded. The results indicated that negatives and possessives were acquired at much the same time in both languages and at a comparable rate with monolingual subjects. Interrogatives tended to be acquired earlier in Spanish than in English. The authors argued that, in contrast to negatives and possessives which require equal numbers of transformations in English and Spanish, Spanish interrogatives undergo two successive transformations whereas English interrogatives undergo three transformations. The rate of the development of interrogative structures in English and Spanish appeared yet again to be *en par with* that of monolingual children of English and Spanish, respectively. However, this study was not specifically designed for the comparison of bilingual

and monolingual children.

In an earlier study, Padilla and Liebman (1975) compared the rate of linguistic development of three bilingual Spanish/English children with that of monolingual children by Mean Length of Utterance (MLU). They compared their subjects' MLU growth with that of Brown's (1973) subjects and found them to be comparable. During the early stages of first language acquisition MLUs are generally taken as an indication of the level of structural development.

Case studies of bilingual children have generally stated that the children's acquisition of the language of the wider community was in no way affected by the simultaneous acquisition of a minority language. (Leopold 1939-1949; Taeschner 1982; Kielhofer and Jonekeit 1983; Porsche 1983; Fantini 1985; Hoffmann 1985; Saunders 1982, 1988). However, the use of the minority language has often been reported as halting and semantically and idiomatically less varied than monolingual children's language use (Saunders 1982; Taeschner 1983). Case studies have commonly involved middle class families only.

Regrettably, the question of whether bilingual children develop language at the same rate as monolingual children or are, as is commonly believed, relatively slower in that respect has not been answered yet, nor has it attracted sufficient interest among researchers in the field. Due to the wide range of developmentally normal language behaviour in monolingual children at any one age, only large scale comparisons of monolingual and bilingual children will ultimately answer this question.

The related concern about linguistic confusion or stuttering suffered by bilingual children also lacks support. Rather than being a developmental problem, stuttering in bilingual children is believed to be an attitudinal problem caused by adults (Dodson 1983; Saunders 1988). In a paper on causes of stuttering by Johnson (1967), bilingualism was not even mentioned. Instead, he found that the perception of age-related disfluencies like the

onset of stuttering were the most potent cause for long term stuttering problems. Saunders (1988) argues that bilingual children's language development tends to be more closely monitored than that of monolingual children and developmental delays and divergencies are often given undue importance.

In summary, the limited evidence so far does not support the popular view that bilingual children are delayed or disturbed in their linguistic development, but rather suggests that bilingualism *per se* does cause developmental delays.

Language mixing: Language mixing and interference between the two languages tend to cause concern to parents and educators. The mixing of elements from both languages on the word or sentence level and switching from one language into the other at the constituent level or sentence boundary are often taken as evidence that the child is overburdened by the simultaneous acquisition of two languages.

Research reports vary with regard to the extent of interference found in bilingual children's speech. This is due to the varying ages of the subjects (1;5 to 6;0 years of age), the direction of interference examined (minority language interfering in production of majority language or vice versa), and the range of interferences studied (lexical, syntactic, semantic, morphological, phonological), as well as environmental conditions such as lack of language separation by parents.

Some agreement has been reached with respect to the decreasing frequency of interference with the increasing age of the child. The debate as to the cause of this has, however, not been settled yet. While some researchers maintain the view that early mixing is due to the child's lack of equivalents for lexical items in the two languages (Padilla and Liebman 1975;Bergman 1976; Lindholm and Padilla 1977,1978; Pye 1986), the majority of studies seems to present evidence that, during the initial stage, the child develops only one lexicon, which contains elements from both languages (Leopold 1954; Totten 1960; Imedadze 1967;

Oksaar 1973; Swain and Wesche 1975; Volterra and Taeschner 1978; Redlinger and Park 1980; Taeschner 1983; Vihman 1985, 1986). The major argument for the one-system theory over the two-system theory (Redlinger and Park 1980; Arnberg 1987) rests on the observation that young bilingual children apparently try to attach quite distinctive meanings to lexical equivalents. For example, Volterra and Taeschner's (1978) subject Lisa insisted for a while that the Italian word for glasses referred to her father's reading glasses and that the German word for glasses referred to glasses which her mother had drawn for her on a piece of paper once. Similarly, the Italian word for mirror was reserved for the mirror in the bedroom and the German word for mirror denoted the mirror in the bathroom.

Most researchers agree that there is hardly any interference on the phonological level(Leopold 1947; Raffler-Engel 1956; Taeschner 1983), the structural area which presents the least cognitive challenge to the language learner (Cummins and Swain 1986:88). Deviations and variations in pronunciation are usually similar to those found in monolingual children (Leopold 1947, 1949; Ruke-Dravina 1965).

Morphological interferences have not been studied very much in child bilingualism; the few studies that have been done have found that morphological interference is rare (Burling 1959; Foster-Meloni 1978; Taeschner 1983; Döpke in prep.). Taeschner (1983:175) suggested that "their purpose is to make the lexical interferences conform to the language in which they are inserted".

Semantic interference refers to the over-extension of a semantic concept in one language to a familiar but not identical semantic concept in another language. Closely related languages are more susceptible to this kind of interference than are more divergent languages. Taeschner (1983) found that semantic interference was rare in her bilingual Italian/German subjects.

Syntactic interference is probably the type of interference which occurs most often after lexical interference. Taeschner

(1983:183) argued that "the form they take can be traced to the way in which sentences are planned in the other language. Since the sequence of a sentence just said or heard is still fresh in the child's mind, and since this sequence forms a perceptive Gestalt, the child is merely replacing items from lexicon A with items from lexicon B, and leaving the structure intact". Another type of syntactic interference is due to the child still being in the process of separating the two syntactic systems. Volterra and Taeschner (1978) argued that separation on the syntactic level is accomplished only after the languages have been separated on the lexical level.

The amount of interference found in bilingual children as reported in various studies ranges from 2-3% (Lindholm and Padilla 1977) to around 30% (Taeschner 1983), depending on the age of the child and the area of interference under observation. Generally, language mixing and interference are *perceived as* occurring more frequently than is actually the case.

Dodson (1983) argued that bilingual children's acquisition strategies need to be seen relative to monolingual children's acquisition strategies. Monolingual children, too, have preferred words, and avoid those which are difficult to pronounce or just less appealing to them. The bilingual child simply has a greater range to choose from: instead of choosing between *bow wow* and *dog* , he/she can choose between *bow wow* , *dog* , *wau wau*, and *Hund* , for example. Preferred words from two languages easily lead to mixed structures at an early age. Just as the monolingual child may say *bow wow gone* or *dog gone* , the bilingual child can say those two or *Hund weg* or *dog weg* , or any of the other combinations.

Semantic over-extensions are very common in young monolingual children and are believed to be a necessary developmental step in the child's acquisition of his/her first language (E. Clark 1979). Qualitatively they are not different from semantic interferences in young bilingual children.

Syntactic interferences resemble the monolingual child's

strategies of imitating chunks of just heard sentences and integrating them into his/her own linguistic productions (R. Clark 1974, 1977),as in the following example cited in Taeschner (1983:184):

Adult: We're all very mucky.

Child: I all very mucky, too.

A number of scholars have found evidence that the process of separating the two languages depends on how consistently the languages are used in the child's immediate environment. Language mixing by the parents may result in a lack of language separation or a delay in language separation by the child (Burling 1959; Doyle *et al.* 1977; McLaughlin 1978; Fritsche 1982, 1985; Goodz 1987). Temporary interferences occur when one language is used in circumstances usually reserved for the other language (Taeschner 1983; Pedersen 1987).

The issue of interference and separation is as much a sociolinguistic one as it is a linguistic one. It has been found that bilingual children, who usually speak in a linguistically mixed code, are quite capable of separating their languages when faced with monolingual speakers of either language, but they continue to mix the two languages when talking to bilingual speakers (Bergman 1976; Fantini 1978, 1985).

The direction of interference is usually not random. Dodson (1983:416) suggested that "the preference a baby actually shows for one or more words depends to a large extension the relative number of times he (sic!) hears particular words in either language as well as on the amount of pleasure or the satisfaction of other needs the baby can gain by using them". In other words, a qualitative or quantitative imbalance of the two languages may cause the dominant language to interfere in the production of the weaker language (Mikes and Vlahovic 1966; Mikes 1967; McLaughlin 1978, 1984; Saunders 1982; Kielhöfer and Jonekeit 1983). As the child grows older, it is usually the language spoken in the wider community which becomes dominant and causes

deviations in the weaker language due to the more extensive use of the former and because of its higher prestige in the community (Katchan 1985).

Language mixing and interference must be properly distinguished from code switching. The closest that code switching comes to mixing is probably in the case of borrowing lexical items. Borrowing takes place when the bilingual speaker lacks or does not recall a particular word in the language he/she is using at the moment, when a semantic concept can be expressed more easily in the other language, or when the word from the other language fits better into the structure of the sentence as it has developed up to the particular point at which code switching takes place. The speaker is usually conscious of the switch and can give reasons as to why he/she chose to switch. Moreover, code switching is often marked - verbally or nonverbally - and only takes place in a socially appropriate situation, that is, in interaction with other bilingual speakers.

In most cases, a code switch involves more than just one word. Apart from those switches which are unplanned and triggered through bilingual homophones, proper nouns, borrowed words or compromise forms (Clyne 1967, 1969, 1980), code switching is usually functional for the particular situation or the particular conversational move. Situational code switching is determined by changes of participants, settings, discourse type or topic. Conversational code switching serves to emphasize or clarify a point, and it can be used to attract or retain the attention of the listener, to quote somebody, as well as to exclude or include parts of the audience. All of these functions of code switching have been found in bilingual adults as well as bilingual children (Oksaar 1976; Garcia 1980; McClure 1981; Gumperz 1982; Saunders 1982; Harding and Riley 1986).

Thus, code switching is a very differentiated interactional tool and not a sign of incompetence or confusion. Studies on adults (Poplack 1980) and children (McClure 1981) have shown that

there is a positive correlation between bilingual competence and linguistic complexity of code switched discourse.

The amount of code switching in which the individual engages depends very much on the social norms of the community to which he/she belongs. The effect of extensive code switching on the language development of a young child, and especially on his/her ability to separate the two linguistic systems, has not been sufficiently studied as yet. One can, however expect that the child will acquire code switching as the communicative norm in interaction with bilinguals and non-code switched discourse as the communicative norm with monolingual speakers of either of his/her two languages. Provided monolingual interactants are available for the child, the two linguistic systems will be separated in due course (Lindholm and Padilla 1977, 1978); if not, separation is likely to be delayed until a later point at which non-code switched language behaviour becomes a necessity.

In summary, there is no need to be concerned about language mixing. In part it is a function of normal language learning behaviour, also observed in monolingual children; in part it is due to mixed input. The former will sort itself out with time, the latter needs to be attended to by the bilingual speakers in the environment. If code switching is the norm in a particular bilingual community, then this needs to be regarded as a sociolect particular to and important for this community. Mixed output in the minority language may also be due to a developmental lag between minority and majority language acquisition, with the child getting used to substituting missing items in the minority language with equivalents from the majority language. Once this habit has settled in, it may inhibit the further development in the minority language.

Developmental path: There are very few studies available which have particularly set out to investigate the path which the linguistic development of bilingual children takes as compared with the developmental path taken by monolingual children.

Some of the case studies have reported that their subjects' language developed in much the same way as did monolingual children's language (Leopold 1939-1949; Swain 1972;Fantini 1985;Saunders 1982;de Hower 1987). These comparisons have usually been based on studies of monolingual children done by people other than the author of the bilingual case study and published elsewhere. De Hower (1987:113) criticized this procedure quite rightly for its lack of control of independent variables and methodology used to gather and analyse the data, but acknowledged that such a procedure is unavoidable due to the extent of work involved in collecting,processing and analysing first language acquisition data. Only Taeschner (1983) collected data for comparison herself. Unfortunately, this data is only referred to in very general terms, and we are given no information on which to base a judgement of its methodological stringency. One can only hope that it was adequate.

Leaving the methodological problems and the resulting uncertainty of their theoretical implications aside, these studies all suggest that the path which linguistic development takes in bilingual children is not significantly different from that of monolingual children.

These suggestions are theoretically backed up by the Formal Complexity Theory proposed by Slobin (1973). This theory states that the order in which linguistic devices of any one language are acquired depends on their formal complexity and that their relative order of acquisition cannot be altered.

Padilla (1978) provided some proof of bilingual children's unaltered path of language development. He investigated bilingual children's acquisition of the fourteen morphemes studied by Brown (1973) and de Villiers and de Villiers (1973). This study involved eighteen of the subjects of the previous study, ranging in age from 2;6 to 6;4. However, this time only the 400 English utterances of each child's speech corpus were considered. The results showed that the order of acquisition of these fourteen

morphemes was much the same in the bilingual children as it was in the monolingual children studied by Brown and the two de Villiers. The results showed statistically significant correlations between the youngest bilingual group, aged between 2;6 and 3;9 and both Brown's children and de Villiers' Method I and Method II. The results for Padilla's 4;3 to 4;11 year-old group correlated statistically significantly only with de Villiers Method I, but approached significance in the other correlations. The results obtained for the oldest group aged 5;1 to 6;4 displayed the lowest correlations, and these were not significant. These results suggest that bilingual and monolingual children of similar ages follow the same developmental path. In older bilingual children, i.e. children who are first exposed to only one language and later acquire a second language, the developmental path may be altered.

It has been suggested by a number of researchers in the field, that bilingual children initially only possess one linguistic system made up of linguistic elements from both languages and that language differentiation is a gradual process (Leopold 1954; Imedadze 1967; Oksaar 1973; Swain and Wesche 1975;Swain 1977; Redlinger and Park 1980; Vihman 1985).

Volterra and Taeschner (1978) and Taeschner (1983) proposed a three-stage model of bilingual first language acquisition for the children they observed. During the first stage, the children had only one lexicon consisting of items from both languages, and hardly any equivalents in the two languages.Therefore, they used both languages with everyone, basing their language choice on the pragmatic conditions in which they had first learned to name a particular object or event. The children progressed from single words to vertical constructions and incomplete nuclear sentences in both languages. A few complete nuclear structures also appeared. Morphological and syntactic structures did not appear during the first stage. Most bilingual children discussed in the literature were said to have started to differentiate between the two languages they were exposed to around their second

birthday.

During the second stage, the children realized that their parents spoke two different languages. They started to acquire equivalents in the two languages and oriented their language choice on the language used by the interlocutor. Thus, when the parent switched into the other language, the child followed the switch. However, at some time during the second stage, the children had begun to speak the majority language only. This caused the mother, who was the transmitter of the minority language, to introduce the communicatively effective language switching technique of asking "what?", the result of which was that two months later the children spoke the minority language with her exclusively. Complete nuclear sentences became more frequent, and amplified, complex and bi-nuclear sentences all started to appear simultaneously in both languages. The children acquired the first morphosyntactic markers in both languages in the same way as do monolingual children of the respective languages. The word order was correct, but half way through the second stage examples of intra- and inter-linguistic over-extensions occurred. Both morphological and lexical interferences were observed. These interferences were thought to be due to the children's still lacking ability in differentiating between structural aspects of their two languages. The second stage is believed to take up most of the third year of life the bilingual child's life.

During the third stage, the children adhered rigidly to the 'one parent-one language' principle. They continued to acquire lexical equivalents in both languages. The most important complex bi-nuclear sentence structures were now used with connectives. Both word order and morphosyntactic markers tended to be over-extended incorrectly on the intra-linguistic level as well as from one language to the other. Towards the end of the third stage, interferences and over-extensions decreased considerably. The children were now able to base their language choice on the interlocutor's entire language system. Consequently, their rigidity

weakened, and they were able, yet again, to respond in whatever language was addressed to them (cf.Taeschner 1983: 228-229; previously reported in Döpke 1988: 14-15). According to the majority of records, this is accomplished sometime during the fourth year of life.

This position has since come under attack and and new empirical evidence has been collected to disprove it. Already in 1975, Padilla and Liebman, who had studied a group of bilingual Spanish/English children aged 1;5 to 2;2, argued that their subjects were using two distinct rule systems. Their argument was based on the finding that their subjects displayed structural consistency at the lexical, syntactic and phonological levels in mixed utterances. Counter evidence to the 'structural consistency' argument was presented by Redlinger and Park (1980) and Arnberg (1981), who found redundant reduplications, e.g. *I put it das up*('I put it it up'), and redundant lexical information, e.g. *och the pursen*('and the the purse'), in young bilinguals' mixed sentences. Döpke (forthcoming) argues that such seeming structural inconsistencies may be due to the child's desperate attempts to comply with the sociolinguistic rule of one parent-one language, at an age when the child's lexicon is still lacking equivalents in both languages and when much of the child's output is unanalysed chunks of language.

Meisel (1986, 1987) followed the language development of two bilingual French/German subjects between the age 1;0 and 4;0. The analysis of the data concentrated on word order, case marking and subject-verb agreement. He found that the children applied the different rules for word order in French and German as soon as they produced multiword utterances, and they correctly inflected verbs to agree with subjects according to the rules of each language as soon as they consistently filled the subject slot in their utterances.

De Hower (1987) collected data from one Flemish/English bilingual child between the age of 2;7 and 3;4. She subjected the

data to an intensive structural analysis and came to the conclusion that the separate development hypothesis is the most adequate one. However, this subject was at an age when she could have easily passed through Taeschner's second developmental stage already. This subject's ability to lexically and structurally differentiate between the two languages can therefore not be taken as proof against the hypothesis that children have only one linguistic system during the initial stage of language development.

Bergman (1976, 1981) and Pye (1986) also argued against the initial one-system hypothesis and for the separate development hypothesis. They suggested that inappropriate language choice was due to underdeveloped sociolinguistic rules in the cases of their subjects, but not to an inability to differentiate between the two linguistic systems. Interestingly, Pye (1986) and Vihman (1985) reached opposing conclusions by means of analyzing the same data.

Goodz (1987) supported the separate development hypothesis as well. He suggested that language mixing is due to mixed linguistic input, rather than psycholinguistic factors pertaining to the language learning child.

Arnberg and Arnberg (1985) studied thirteen bilingual English/Swedish children aged 2;10 to 4;0. They compared the children with respect to their language choice in natural interaction and with respect to their linguistic behaviour during word tests. They found that those children who mixed language freely were also prepared to substitute words from one language for the other during the word tests. Since both groups, those who mixed and those who separated the languages, did not differ significantly in vocabulary size, the mixing behaviour could not be explained with lack of vocabulary. In fact, some children who first substituted a word from the other language, later showed that they did know the equivalent. Arnberg and Arnberg concluded that code mixing and code differentiating was a behavioural trait rather than a psycholinguistic necessity. They suggested that language

separation can be motivated by yet to be determined strategies. Early awareness of the two languages as different systems is likely to foster development in both languages.

Earlier studies suggested that the dramatic experience of not being understood often motivates children to separate their languages meticulously (Fantini 1978; Levelt, Sinclair and Jarvella 1978; Arnberg 1979, 1981). This experience of failing to be understood because they chose the 'wrong' language in situations outside the home is a frequent phenomenon for bilingual children. Taeschner (1983) reported an attempt to set up this situation deliberately as a means of increasing the level of minority language development. The technique she used was the "what?" strategy mentioned above. This strategy was very successful in motivating the children to observe the sociolinguistic rules established in the family and hence to progress in both languages. Saunders (1982) introduced a very similar strategy in interaction with his two bilingual German/English sons when they went through periods of reluctance to speak the minority language at the ages of 3;5 to 3;10 and 2;7 to 3;0, respectively. He believes that if he had not done so, the boys would soon have given up speaking German to their father altogether. Dodson (1984) suggested to introduce enjoyable translation games. Such games would help the child to become aware of the extent of separateness between the two languages and support the development of both languages independently of each other. Döpke (in preparation) introduced the categorisation into 'Mummy words' and 'Daddy words' as early as 2;0, at a stage when the child had just started to differentiate objects into Mummy-objects and Daddy-objects, and several months before the child was able to respond to the 'what' strategy appropriately. In many instances, this led to the expression of metalinguistic awareness by the child, e.g. Daddy p*lane for Flugzeug* in the German context, expressing his knowledge of the fact that he was speaking English in the German context and at the same time indicating to the mother

that he could not say the more difficult German word.

In summary, bilingual children appear to pass through similar sequences in the development of both their languages as do monolingual children. To what extent the separation of the two languages is due to psycholinguistic or sociolinguistic factors is not quite clear yet. The fact that language separation can be externally motivated, however, points towards the Independent Development Hypothesis, first proposed by Bergman (1976).

Cognitive development

Until about thirty years ago, bilingualism was widely believed to have negative effects on children's cognitive development. This view was supported by research in the field, which overwhelmingly reported correlations between bilingualism and school failure (see Darcy 1953, MacNamara 1966, Peal and Lambert 1962, for reviews of these studies). The seminal work of Peal and Lambert in 1962 drew attention to the fact that sampling methods had been lacking in accuracy and had created biases against bilingual children. Most bilingual children had been drawn from lower socio-economic classes and could, therefore, be expected to do less well in school than middle class children anyway, and many of the children sampled as bilingual were, in fact, monolingual children with ethnic-sounding family names. Moreover, the tests which the children were made to undergo tended to compare only one of the bilingual's languages with the verbal skills of monolinguals and did not consider the children's total linguistic proficiency.

Peal and Lambert (1962), who controlled for degree of bilingualism, social class, sex and age, found that bilingual children scored better on non-verbal *and* verbal intelligence tests, had more positive attitudes to English (i.e. the second language) as well as to school achievement, were better school performers in general, and had more positive attitudes towards English-

Canadians than their monolingual French peers who served as controls. Lambert and Anisfield (neé Peal) (1969) defended the study against criticisms that the cause-effect relationship of bilingualism and intelligence was obscured by only including balanced bilinguals into the study. The re-analysis of the data ensured that it was not the more intelligent children who had become balanced bilinguals, but that it was the bilingualism which had favourable effects on their performance in cognitive tests.

Since then, a large number of tightly controlled studies has been conducted which looked into various cognitive aspects of bilingualism. Bilingual children were compared with monolingual children for metalinguistic awareness and for their facility in divergent thinking tasks. They were also tested for non-verbal intelligence and compared with monolingual children in that respect.

In the following, research reports concerning each of these three aspects of cognitive development will be presented and their results will be discussed. Subsequently, the findings will be viewed in the light of existing developmental frameworks. Finally, the relationship between degree of bilingualism and developmental advantage will be considered.

Metalinguistic awareness: Metalinguistic awareness is tested by means of tasks which require the subjects to differentiate between form and meaning. During ordinary conversations, attention is focussed on meaning. Focussing on the form of the linguistic information instead of the meaning involves the deliberate control of linguistic processes.

The most widely used test of metalinguistic awareness is the "sun/moon" test, developed by Piaget (1929). Children are asked whether it would be possible to call the sun 'moon', and which time of day it would be if that 'moon' was up in the sky. Vygotsky (1962) suggested that bilingual children should be able to agree to this exchange of labels and to predict the ensuing consequences at an

earlier age than monolingual children.

Ianco-Worrall (1972) and Ben-Zeev (1977a,b) found that to be the case. In Ianco-Worrall's study, the bilingual advantage was greater for the four-to-six year-olds than for the seven-to-nine year-olds. In Ben-Zeev's study, the advantage was greater for the middle-class subjects than for the working class subjects. Feldman and Shen (1971) found similar differences between two groups of four- to six year-old children from low socio-economic status (SES) groups - one Mexican-American, one Black American. The bilingual Mexican-American group of children was better able than the monolingual Black American group to switch labels and to use switched common nouns and nonsense names in relational statements. However, Cummins' (1978) variation of the "sun/moon" experiment to "dog/cat" displayed the 'bilingual advantage' only for correctness of reasoning as to why this switch is possible, but not for the follow-up question of: "If this cat is now called 'dog', which sound does it make?". In the latter study, the two groups of children were aged eight-to-nine and eleven-to-twelve, respectively.

Other tests relating to the independence of sound and meaning were first used by Ianco-Worrall (1972) and later by Cummins (1978). They involved explanations of the relationship between label and referent ("Why is the chair called 'chair'?"), contemplation of the possibility for renaming referents ("Could you call the chair 'table' and the table 'chair'?") and realization of the nonphysical nature of words ("Let us call a book 'water'. Can you drink this water? Can you read this water?").

In both studies, bilingual children were more likely than monolingual children to consider the renaming of objects a possibility. However, the explanations of the relationship between label and referent in Ianco-Worrall's study did not show bilingual children to be different from monolingual children, whereas in Cummins' study the justification for why one could or could not exchange the labels for things did show differences between

bilingual and monolingual children. Among the younger children (eight and nine year-olds) bilingual and monolingual children were equally likely to give empirical reasons for their decisions, while among the older children (eleven and twelve year-olds) this was an unlikely way of reasoning for the bilingual children. Of those children who opted for a justification of their decision along the line of the conventional nature of language, about half of the younger monolingual children argued that linguistic conventions are rigid and exchanges of labels therefore not possible.This tendency was weakened for the older monolingual children.

Among the bilingual children, only one child in each age group put the 'rigid convention' argument forward. Overall, 40% of the bilingual eight-to-nine year-old children and 85% of the bilingual eleven-to-twelve year-old children were aware of the arbitrariness of language, which contrasted with 23% of the younger and 39% of the older monolingual children who had reached this stage of awareness.

The differences in results with regard to the type of justification for renaming offered by bilingual and monolingual subjects in the two studies is likely to be due to the fact that Ianco-Worrall's subjects were younger than Cummins' subjects. Even in Cummins' study, the bilingual advantage was much more distinct for the older of his subjects than it was for the younger ones.

Age also played a role in another experiment run by Ianco-Worrall (1972). Here, bilingual and monolingual four-to-six and seven-to-nine year-old were asked which two words out of groups of three were most alike (*e.g.* cap–can–hat). The difference between bilingual and monolingual subjects was most pronounced in the younger age group: the younger bilinguals behaved more like the older bilingual *and monolingual* children in that they considered the semantic relationship first.

With respect to the nonphysical nature of words in the last question, neither Ianco-Worrall nor Cummins could assure statistically significant differences between bilingual and

monolingual groups.

Cummins (1978) additionally asked his subjects to evaluate empirical and non-empirical statements. He found the bilingual children to be superior to the monolingual children in judging many, but not all, of the items. He explained these difference with bilingual children's "greater flexibility and analytic orientation to linguistic input".

One recent study appears to contradict the positive findings regarding bilingualism. Rosenblum and Pinker (1983) studied four-to-six year-olds, matched not only for sex and age but also for their willingness to consider counterfactual thinking. The authors felt this to be an independent variable previously neglected in studies exploring children's attitudes towards the word-object relationship. Their results did not support the claim that bilinguals had an advantage over in name-manipulation tasks and the authors doubted that there was enough evidence for a differential awareness of the word-object relationship. Katchan(1985), however,drew attention to the fact that Rosenblum and Pinker's bilingual subjects offered more and different types of reasons when asked question such as "why can/cannot you call this X a Y?" As in Cummins' study, monolingual children were more likely to argue along the lines of physical properties, whereas bilingual children tended to refer to the social context of the naming process and the resulting shared knowledge of the speech community. Katchan suggested that, if the dependent variable in the Rosenblum and Pinker study had been the number of correct justifications given by the children, the authors would have had to concede that their results provided further evidence for the superiority of bilinguals.

Tunmer and Myhill (1984) argued that fully fluent bilingualism increases children's metalinguistic awareness which in turn facilitates the acquisition of reading skills. In that way, bilingualism is seen as having lasting effects on children's academic development. Alternatively, reading skills are believed to develop

children's metalinguistic awareness, in which case the bilingual advantage would again be more pronounced for younger subjects and diminishing as both groups of subjects increase in age (Bialystok 1988b).

Bialystok (1988a) suggested that metalinguistic awareness consists of two processing components: analysis of linguistic knowledge, and control of linguistic processes. The former is the ability to construct explicit representations of linguistic knowledge,the latter is the ability to control linguistic processes by intentionally selecting and applying knowledge to arrive at a solution (Bialystok 1988a:155).She argued that bilingualism only affects the control of linguistic processes, and that tests of metalinguistic awareness which do not differentiate between the two types of processing components sufficiently are bound to lead to inconsistent results.

One such test which tapped subjects' control of linguistic processes was carried out by Ben-Zeev (1977a,b). Bilingual and monolingual subjects were asked to participate in a grammatical violation which involved the exchange of "I" for "macaroni" in sentences such as "I am warm". Bilingual children were significantly superior to monolingual children in supplying the correct "macaroni am warm" response. Ben-Zeev took this as evidence for bilingual children's superior grammar control.

In summary, many, but not all, of the tests which were devised to test children's metalinguistic awareness showed bilingual children to be superior to monolingual children in that respect. The relative degree of the 'bilingual advantage' depended on the age of the children as well as on the type of test.

Divergent thinking :Bilinguals have consistently been shown to perform superior to monolinguals on tasks of divergent thinking (Torrance *et al.*1970; Ianco-Worrall 1972; Scott 1973; Cummins and Gulutsan 1974; Ben-Zeev 1977 a,b). This ability is tested through tasks such as "Think of X and tell me how many things you can do with it." Following Guilford (1967), a child's adeptness

at divergent thinking is taken as an indication of his/her verbal creativity.

Scott (1973) and Landry (1974) claimed that this ability increased with age. In both cases, however, the bilingual subjects were drawn from immersion programs. Thus, it is likely that it was degree of bilingualism rather than age which produced the cognitive advantage of the bilingual subjects.

Kessler and Quinn (1987) compared bilingual and monolingual eleven year-olds who were involved in an inquiry-based science program during which they learned to formulate scientific hypotheses in a problem-solving setting. The children's written hypotheses provided the data base. Bilinguals were found to outperform monolinguals in quality of hypotheses as well as on syntactic and semantic measures. This was taken as an indication of enhanced linguistic and cognitive creativity due to the bilingual language proficiency.

Explanations offered for this phenomenon draw on the cognitive flexibility needed by the bilingual child in order to overcome negative transfer between the languages (Landry 1974; Ben-Zeev 1977 a,b). Torrance *et al.* (1970:74) hypothesized that "the tension resulting from the competition of new and old associations facilitates originality in thinking and plays important roles in scientific and artistic breakthroughs."

The significance of these results has been questioned (Macnamara 1972; Cummins 1974; Swain and Cummins 1979). Matching for SES does not ensure for matched conditions in other areas of developmental background, such as cultural stimulation and social interaction. Moreover, Scott (1973) suggested a possible causal relationship between the ability to perform well in divergent thinking tasks and degree of bilingualism attained. The status of divergent thinking as a dependent variable is therefore questionable.

Non-verbal intelligence: In Lambert and Peal's original study in 1962, the comparison of bilingual and monolingual subjects on

measures of non-verbal intelligence was seen as a way of avoiding the cultural and linguistic biases of verbal intelligence tests. They found bilingual subjects to perform superior to monolingual subjects on the Raven's Progressive Matrices test. In Ben-Zeev's studies (1977 a,b), the bilingual subjects exceeded the monolingual subjects on several non-verbal tasks which required perceptual analysis.

These results suggest that the greater verbal flexibility carries over to non-verbal tasks. They are an indication that non-verbal tasks are also mediated through language (Vygotsky 1962; Hakuta and Diaz 1985).

Gorrell (1987) studied the spatial role-taking abilities of bilingual and monolingual kindergarten children. Such tasks call on children's ability to differentiate between their own point of view and that of others. It is widely accepted that the non-egocentric perspective has not fully developed at this age, but due to the earlier onset of the concrete operational stage in bilingual children, Gorrell hypothesized that they should also be able to infer another person's spatial perspective at an earlier age than are monolingual children. The subjects were partly monolingual in Spanish, partly monolingual in English and partly bilingual in Spanish and English. The ages of the children ranged from 5;2 to 6;4. In contrast to an earlier study by Gorrell *et al.* (1982), this study showed no advantage of bilingual children over monolingual children. Gorrell thought that to be a function of the more sensitive and precise tasks as well as the subjects' closer age range in the second study.

Developmental frameworks: The question arises as to how differences between bilingual and monolingual children, displayed in isolated tests, relate to the developmental frameworks of child psychologists.

Hakes (1980) tried to tie in the findings on bilinguals' cognitive advantage due to their greater metalinguistic awareness at an earlier age, with Piaget's developmental framework arguing that

"the general ability whose development underlies the emergence of developmentally advanced metalinguistic performance is the same as that whose development underlies the emergence of concrete operational thought, *i.e.* an increased ability to stand back from a situation mentally and reflect upon it" (Katchan 1985:10). Cummins (1976) suggested that the bilingual advantage would become important again at the for, since language might have a facilitating effect for certain formal operations which are closely related to symbolic functioning (Katchan 1985:11).

Several studies have undertaken to test this possibility. Liedke and Nelson (1968) tested bilingual and unilingual grade one children, matched for age, SES, sex and IQ, on Piagetian concept formation tasks. They found that the bilingual children outperformed the monolingual children. Bain (1975) reported significant differences between bilingual and monolingual six-year olds on a rule discovery test. At age eleven, however, the differences were not significant any more. In contrast, the bilingual children's ability to classify physiognomic expressions on a Portrait Sensitivity Test showed an increasing advantage over their monolingual peers with age. Bain and Yu (1978) replicated this research cross-cultural. The bilingual advantage was generally confirmed for the cross-cultural sample, but cultural differences determined the degree of difference between bilingual and monolingual children.

Gorrell *et al.* (1982) and Gorrell (1987), reported above, investigated bilingual and monolingual children's ability to perform spatial role-taking tasks. The more tightly controlled second study did not replicate the previously found advantage of bilingual children over monolingual children.

These studies suggest that bilingual children enter the concrete operational stage and the formal operational stage at an earlier age than do monolingual children. It is possible, but not tested yet, that the pre-operational stage is also entered into somewhat earlier by bilingual children than by monolingual children.

Controversies in these studies are likely to be the result of insufficient control of the relative stages which experimental and control groups were in. Differences between bilingual and monolingual children found during the transition from one stage to the next are bound to level out as both groups progress further into the next stage and the particular ability tested reaches its ceiling, but differences will reappear in the transition to the next developmental stage.

These findings concerning bilingual children's relative faster development in comparison to monolingual children do, in fact, contradict Piaget's claim that language plays a secondary role for children's cognitive growth. Rather than language being an outcome of the child's need to detach objects from its sensorimotor action scheme, it must be considered a constructive force in the detachment process (Blank 1975; Karmiloff-Smith 1979). This position is also taken by Vygotsky (1962), who argues that the bilingual children have a more flexible speech system which equips them better to use speech for the mediation of the discovery side of the analytical process than does the speech system of monolingual children at the same age. Katchan (1985:15) suggested that "even Leontiev appears to leave room for the possibility that two languages might be able to handle such tasks more easily" than one language when he said:

> "Man (sic!) does not think in a way determined by language, he mediates his thoughts through language to the extent to which language answers to the content and to the tasks of his thought." (Leontiev 1981:108)

Bain (1976) and Bain and Yu (1980) investigated bilingual children's cognitive development relative to Luria's (1961) developmental framework. In particular, they studied cognitive consequences of the 'one parent-one language' principle. Although the differences between bilingual and monolingual children did not reach statistical significance at age 1;10 and 2;0, bilingual children typically performed ahead of their monolingual age-

mates on language related tests of cognitive maturity at age 3;10 and 4;0. As in the earlier studies, these differences were found to varying degrees in the cultural combinations investigated, indicating that cultural background also had a bearing on the rate of cognitive development. Bain and Yu (1980:312) suggested that it is the very principle of 'one parent-one language' which facilitates the mastery of the four interrelated functions of language proposed by Luria (1961), *i.e.* separation of sound and meaning, differentiation between meaning of the communication and the communicator, abstracting the general category from the particular experience, and self-control of one's cognitive dynamics.

Degree of bilingualism: Many of the studies which reported positive developmental effects of bilingualism tacitly or openly assumed high levels of bilingualism. This section will discuss the role which degree of bilingualism plays for the outcome of such studies.

In order to account for the inconsistencies in the literature, Cummins (1979a) proposed the existence of two thresholds: the lower threshold level represents the minimal linguistic skills in either one of the two language which children must attain in order to prevent damaging effects on cognition being caused by bilingualism; the upper threshold level represents well-developed linguistic skills in both languages which allow cognitive acceleration. In between these two thresholds, effects from bilingualism are neither negative nor positive.

This hypothesis is congruent with findings by Barik and Swain (1976), later replicated by Harley and Lapkin (1984), as well with Cummins'(1977) further analysis of Cummins and Gulutsan (1974). Barik and Swain (1976) found an increase in IQ scores of high French achievers over a three-year period. During the same period, low French achievers' IQ scores remained unchanged. The subjects were drawn from two French immersion programs in Canada. Cummins (1977) suggested that only those bilinguals who had attained a relatively high level of second

language competence performed at a higher level on the verbal originality task (administered in L1) while children who remained dominant in their home language were in a disadvantage in relation to monolingual children on verbal fluency and flexibility skills (Cummins and Swain 1986:16).

Hakuta and Diaz (1985) and Hakuta (1987) conducted a tightly controlled study of children with varying degrees of bilinguality. The children's level of bilingualism at Time 1 reliably predicted their performance on a non-verbal intelligence test (Raven's Progressive Matrices) at Time 2, but not the reverse. Thus, the relationship between level of bilingualism and level of cognitive achievement was shown to be unidirectional.

Bialystok (1988b) tested the relationship between degree of bilingualism and performance on tasks of metalinguistic awareness on groups of French/English and Italian/English children aged 6;6 to 7;0 and their monolingual age-mates. The results showed that degree of bilingualism correlated positively with performance on metalinguistic tasks. Both partially bilingual subjects and fully bilingual subjects exceeded monolingual subjects on test which involved the control of linguistic processes (sun/moon, dog/cat); but only fully bilingual subjects were significantly superior to monolingual subjects on one of the tests which involved the analysis of linguistic knowledge (judging and defining words) and superior to monolingual *and* partially bilingual subjects with respect to the other (syntax correction). She concludes that "the inconsistencies previously reported in the literature for assessment of the metalinguistic skills of bilingual children [must be attributed to two methodological problems: the use of metalinguistic tasks in which these skill components are confounded and the comparison of bilingual children who differ in their bilingual experience" (Bialystok 1988b:566).

In summary, we would like to assert that bilingualism *per se does* certainly not have any negative effects on cognition. In fact, the opposite appears to be the case: high levels of bilingualism

have accelerating effects on children's cognitive development, verbally and non-verbally. The important question then is: which are the factors in a child's environment which assure high levels of bilingualism?

Emotional development

Research has not usually concerned itself with the emotional consequences of parents' decision to speak or not to speak their own language with their children after they have arrived in a new country. However, earlier anecdotal reports suggesting negative influences of bilingualism on personality development (Müller 1934; Weinreich 1953; Diebold 1968) have since been rejected as confusing bilingualism with co-occurring social variables (Porsché 1978; Dodson 1983; Appel and Muysken 1987).

A number of studies have shown that a shift away from the home language does not solve social or emotional problems. Instead, the opposite appears to be the case. In a comparison of Turkish and Moroccan children in transitional and monolingual programs in the Netherlands, the children in the transitional programs were found to have fewer problems (Appel, Everts and Teunissen 1986). In another study, no differences were found between two groups of Spanish/English bilingual children on three of four measures of psycho-social adjustment. The fourth measure (repetition of a school year) favoured those children whose families had stopped speaking Spanish in the home.

In an informal talk a few years ago, a Namibian school psychologist working in a bilingual German/Afrikaans high school reported that 'unreal' monolingual children, *i.e.* children whose parents were from a mixed German/Afrikaans background but had decided to speak only Afrikaans with their children, had behavioural problems relatively more often than children from families where both languages were continued or where both parents were German and German was the only language spoken

in the home. He put this down to the connotative meaning potential, and hence the emotional aspect of the relationship, being impoverished in a situation where a parent speaks a language to the child which he/she is not utterly at home with.

For any child, it is important to establish emotional and intellectual closeness with his/her parents. Most parents are best able to communicate their feelings in their own language. They are also best equipped to transmit their way of thinking, which is closely related to their cultural heritage, in their own language. Unless these parental needs are met, children are not able to experience their parents as whole persons.

In many cases, children are only able to experience their parents as competent speakers of *a* language when they communicate with them in their parents' first language. Elwert (1959:239) addressed this point when he wrote that "it was positively embarrassing for us to hear [our mother] speaking 'incorrectly', to see her in a position of inferiority" (translated from German by Saunders 1988:105). This feeling was enthusiastically endorsed by some of the bilingual students in the Applied Linguistics Program at Melbourne University.

Saunders (1982), who raises his children according to the principle of 'one person-one language' in Australia, reported that his children objected heavily when asked whether German should be given up. The author suggested that the language used in parent-child dyads creates a bond which can not easily be broken without affecting the emotional relationship.

Emotional relationship and quality of interaction are interdependent in parent-child dyads (Döpke 1986; Döpke 1988). Moreover, high quality of interaction and a good emotional relationship support rate of language acquisition as well as cognitive/emotional development (van IJzendoorn *et al.* 1987; Bus and van IJzendoorn 1988; Döpke 1988). By the same token, rate of language acquisition and cognitive/emotional development may be impaired if the parents are less than competent speakers

of the language used for interaction between them and their children.

In summary, resettling in a new country is least disruptive to family cohesion and children's cognitive/emotional development if the parents' first language is maintained in the home.

Educational development

Inspite of the evidence accumulated by scholars in the fields of linguistics and psychology, showing that bilingualism *per se* does not have any negative effects on children's linguistic and cognitive development, disproportionately large numbers of bilingual children are unsuccessful in school. Lambert (1977) suggested that certain social factors influence the levels of proficiency which bilingual speakers attain. In what follows, these factors will be described and discussed.

Prior to the 1960s, which introduced tight variable controls for studies of developmental effects of bilingualism, research reports predominantly attested that children of immigrant families who were native speakers of languages other than the majority language of the host country, and hence the language of education, were badly disadvantaged in school. Little was known about the extent of these children's bilingualism and general language aptitude, but nevertheless bilingualism was claimed to be the cause for it.

Hansegård (1968) coined the term 'halvspråkighet', later translated into 'semilingualism', for bilingual Finnish-Swedish children's less than complete language proficiency in both languages. This term and the ensuing concept has since been used in Sweden (Skutnabb-Kangas 1975, 1978; Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa 1976; Toukomaa and Skutnabb-Kangas 1977; Lasonen and Toukomaa 1978), and has also gained currency outside Sweden (Cummins 1979a). Alternatively, this phenomenon has been termed 'subtractive bilingualism' (Lambert

1975; Swain 1979) and 'less than native-like competence' (Cummins 1976, 1979a) by researchers in Canada.

'Semilingualism', or 'subtractive bilingualism', is associated with a situation in which a child acquires a first language in the home and develops all the necessary linguistic competence deal with his/her pre-school home life in the first language. Subsequently, the child is placed into a second language environment in school.The school environment does not only force the child to acquire a new language, but also expects the child to acquire a different set of linguistic skills. Due to the limited proficiency in the second language, the second language learner is not yet able to cope with the new linguistic demands. Consequently, an intellectual gap between monolingual and bilingual children develops which manifests itself in the child's inability to manipulate language for intellectual purposes. At the same time, the development of the home language stagnates, due to a lack of new and intellectually stimulating demands in the home language environment. Thus, bilingual eight to ten year old children may find themselves in a situation where they are unable to speak their home language with the same degree of sophistication as monolingual children of their own age as well. Skills in their second language may also lag behind their monolingual peers in the host country, due to the initial interruption to their intellectual development.

Cummins (1979a) clearly endorsed the notion of 'semilingualism' , but was concerned about the value-laden implications of the term. Instead he found it important to differentiate between basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) and cognitive/academic language proficiency (CALP) (Cummins 1979b, Cummins and Swain 1983).BICS are faster to acquire than is CALP. BICS make use of language which is cognitively undemanding and context-embedded (Cummins 1983). The meaning of the linguistic message is interactively negotiated and supported by a wide range of paralinguistic and situational

cues. CALP, on the other hand, is cognitively demanding and context-reduced. It "relies primarily on linguistic cues to meaning and may in some cases involve suspending knowledge of the 'real' world in order to interpret (or manipulate) the logic of the communication appropriately" (Cummins and Swain 1986:152f). Such skills are the primary factors in the development of literacy. They are specified as (1) vocabulary-concept knowledge; (2) metalinguistic awareness; and (3) the ability to process decontextualized discourse,spoken or written (Cummins 1979a, Cummins and Swain 1983; Martin-Jones and Romaine 1985). While basic interpersonal communication skills are language dependent, cognitive/academic language proficiency is not (Keats and Keats 174; Keats, Keats and Liu Fan 1982).

Children in linguistic submersion situations often appear to acquire satisfactory-to-good basic interpersonal communication skills which lure teachers and psychologists into believing that they have no more language problems, when in fact they have not yet acquired age-appropriate cognitive/academic language proficiency. Cummins claims that it is this lack of insight into the more complex aspects of language development which creates language minority students' academic deficits.

'Semilingualism' as well as the BICS/CALP distinction have come under vehement attack. Edelsky *et al.*(1983) criticized the notion of 'semilingualism' for its implied idealization of 'full' competence. The criteria by which semilingualism is measured and diagnosed amount to "a confused grab-bag of prescriptive and descriptive components" (Edelsky *et al.* 1983:2). Moreover, the term has been used inconsistently for either only bilingual children or bilingual children as well as monolingual children. The BICS/CALP distinction was called 'a spurious language deficiency dichotomy' by Edelsky *et al.*(1983:4).

Martin-Jones and Romaine (1985) endorsed this criticism arguing that, far from being linguistically interdependent, CALP skills are highly culture-specific. They relate to a specific set of

cognitive abilities required and fostered by our school system. In their view, "cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) can only be understood as appropriate display of schooled language" (Martin-Jones and Romaine 1985:30). They further pointed out that our schools only promote and reward certain types of literacy skills, thereby discriminating against children who have acquired a different set of cognitively demanding and decontextualized skills. Heath (1982) illustrates this point: the black community she studied had a rich oral tradition, and their children entered school with the ability to tell and make up stories in a much more advanced manner than their white middle class age mates. This ability was, however, not asked for and not fostered in school for several years. By the time these skills were expected of them, the black children had been completely disenchanted with school.

Notions like CALP and semilingualism are seen as proposing a new type of deficit theory. Their proponents are criticized for their apparent failure to acknowledge the primary role of social and economic factors for bilingual children's school failure, instead assuming an intervening language factor to be responsible for the outcome of educational programs for minority children (Brent Palmer 1979; Edelsky *et al.* 1983; Martin-Jones and Romaine 1985).

We agree with the above position which stresses the close relationship between socio-economic factors and school achievement. However, we do not agree with the criticism of Cummins' position.

The experience of school failure is not restricted to immigrant children from non-English-speaking countries. High proportions of monolingual children from lower socio-economic classes are unequipped to comply with the academic demands of our school system as well. The crucial question to ask is: what is it about low SES (socio-economic status) membership that causes low academic achievement?

Turning to the characteristics of the educational system for an answer to this question, we find that the use of language is central

to our evaluation of intellectual and academic achievement. Literacy and other decontextualized uses of language are particularly highly valued in all areas of social life associated with power. Although this might be ethnocentric and chauvinistic and other intellectual abilities might be on a similar level of cognitive sophistication, the primacy of literacy is a reality of the power distribution in our society. Wells (1985a, 1985b, 1986) and his colleagues from the Bristol Language Development Study followed a large group of children through their pre-school and primary school years. Their aim was to pin-point the differences in language acquisition environment experienced by children from various social classes. At the end of the first five years of the study, when the children were just about ready to enter primary school, no such difference was found yet. All children were able to communicate sufficiently in their particular environments. None of the children were a-lingual or non-verbal. Although the individual differences were vast, all children had had a range of rich language experiences.

The project was then extended by another five years. Soon after school entry considerable differences emerged with regard to how well the children coped with the intellectual requirements of the new environment. In most, though not all cases, school success correlated with the socio-economic status of the children's families. On re-inspection of the pre-school data, Wells found that school success correlated significantly with the number of stories the children had listened to during their pre-school years. Other literacy-related activities like drawing and colouring, looking at picture books and talking about them, and writing or pretending to write, all also tended towards correlation with school success, but did not reach statistical significance.

Wells (1986:156) explained these results as follows:

> What is important about listening to stories, then, is that, through this experience, the child is beginning to discover the symbolic potential of language: its power to create possible or

> imaginary worlds through words - by representing experience in symbols that are independent of the objects, events and relationships symbolized and that can be interpreted in contexts other than those in which the experience originally occurred, if indeed it ever occurred at all.

The suspicious co-occurrence of immigrant children's SES and school success or failure and the absence of an unconditional relationship between bilingualism and school achievement point towards other factors as instrumental in this process. In the light of Wells's findings, Cummins' distinction between BICS and CALP becomes considerably more valid. The development of CALP is contingent on the introduction to decontextualized language (Heath 1982; Cummins 1983; Snow 1983;Wells 1985b, 1986). It is the knowledge of what language can be used *for* which is independent of the knowledge of a particular language.

Bilingualism and social identity

So far in this paper we have considered the psychological aspects of bilingualism from the point of view of the individual, especially the child.But another branch of psychology, social psychology, has much to contribute to our understanding of bilinguals and bilingualism.Social psychology is the branch of psychology which explores among other topics such things as attitudes and those aspects of our identity which derive from our sense of belonging or not belonging to groups.

The future potential for bilingualism in Australia is a function of people's attitudes to languages and varieties of language. In this section of the paper some recent Australian research on language attitudes is discussed, paying particular attention to the intergroup context in which these attitudes are formed, maintained or changed. A social psychological model, Social Identity Theory (Tajfel 1982), will be used as the framework for the discussion. In order to plan for the promotion, development

and conservation of bilingual resources in Australia, we need to be aware of the (usually unconscious) social forces assisting or militating against our efforts.In other words, it is not enough to see the choice of bilingualism or not as an individual choice, but as a choice which is heavily constrained by our identity as members (or non-members) of salient groups in the social contexts in which we live.

Social identity theory: This theory was originally developed by Henri Tajfel at the University of Bristol and subsequently extended and modified by, among others, John Turner, now at Macquarie University, and Mike Hogg, now at the University of Melbourne.None of these writers have concerned themselves particularly with language, although Tajfel and Hogg have written briefly about it, but other social psychologists have applied the theory to language issues. The best known of these are perhaps Howard Giles, another of Tajfel's colleagues at B successor in the Chair of Social Psychology there, and Canadians such as Richard Bourhis and Donald Taylor.

Social Identity Theory proposes a four-stage sequence, which can be sketched graphically as follows (Husband 1982):

Social categorization

Search for positive psychological social identity

The formation of distinctiveness

Social comparison

What do these rather abstract and forbidding terms mean?

a) Social categorization: It has been shown that in our perception of the physical world we use categories to classify and organize our perceptions of stimuli that can be shown to be objectively rather different. For example, it was shown experimentally by Tajfel and Wilkes (1963) that the categorization of physical phenomena leads to accentuation effects (differences between things categorized as "unlike" are exaggerated, as are similarities between things categorized as "like"). This cognitive phenomenon is functional; it allows us to lump together things

that are in fact rather different in order to make sense of input from the environment. We tend to see things as like or unlike other things; reducing the processing task (we don't have to pay attention to every detail) helps us to cope with the myriad diversity of physical phenomena.

In the social world, too, we use categories to reduce the complexity of our experience to manageable proportions. In Tajfel's words, we use "cognitive categories" to "segment, classify and order the social environment"; these categories "enable the individual to undertake many forms of social action" (Tajfel and Turner 1979:40).

We allocate individuals to one category or another on the basis of cues. In the case of ethnic categories, these cues may be ones to do with physical appearance, or language usage, for example.

Some categories have associated with them *other characteristics* which are assumed to follow from membership of the category; in other words, categories may have associated *stereotypes*.

The categories that we use are socially derived and are learned from the social environment. And, just as social settings vary, so do the categories we use to perceive the social world. For example, in our society, weight is a cue to a potential rather than a very real category. Do we really, like Shakespeare's Julius Caesar, consider "lean" people to be dangerous? Or fat people to be "warm and friendly"? In a different interethnic context, however, the issue may be rather different. Samoans, for example, who tend to be rather heavy by European standards, are often branded by Europeans in Samoa as "lazy" or "slow" on the basis of their weight (Joseph Lo Bianco, personal communication).

It is sobering to realize how "naturalized" these categories may become, and how arbitrary the cues to membership of them are. An Englishwoman who spent the first twelve years of her life in rural Nigeria said that one of the things she had to learn when her family returned to England was that it mattered whether a

person was black or white.This had never occurred to her as being of significance in the context in which she had grown up.It would be as if chin-shape were the basis of powerful social categorizations and we were not tuned in to this as the basis for our understanding of the social world, so that people were perceived as naive or unaware.

It is interesting to see the growth of an awareness of the relevant categories in the development of social identity in the child.In a study of Hebrew-speaking families from Israel living in Melbourne to be discussed below (McNamara 1988b),one informant,a mother of two young children

born in Israel but growing up in Australia, discussed the process in her children.The children had moved from a world in which Jewish cultural identity and Jewish cultural symbols were the norm and taken for granted, to one in which Christian symbolism pervaded social life and Jewishness was a separate, minority identity:

> It took her quite a long time to understand the fact that we're Jewish and it comes up usually during Christmas.Well she sees all the ads on television and it looks beautiful and she says "Can we have a Christmas tree?" so I said "Look we can't have a Christmas tree because we're Jewish and Jews don't have Christmas trees" but sometimes Hanukkah [Jewish Festival of Lights, usually falling in December] comes but I said to her "I don't have to justify because the Christians have Christmas we have Hanukkah, this is how it goes and this is how it is".So now every time we go she says "Is it true that we're Jewish, *nachon she anachnu Yehudim* ?" and things like this.I said "Yes, we're Jewish"... I remember going with my son through the same stages because we came here he was three and a half and by the time he was four and a half we went through a Christmas and... we went actually a year later we went on a trip and we got to Canberra and went into a motel and one of the maids there asked the kids "Did you have nice presents for Christmas?" (it

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

> was Christmas time) and my son said to her "We don't celebrate Christmas" (he was four and a half) "we're Jewish but we had presents for Hanukkah"...

Language may be an important cue for inter-ethnic categorization (cf Giles's (1979) work on identity markers in speech).In Australia, Callan, Gallois and Forbes (1983) have studied evaluative reactions to accented Australian speech and have explored the stereotypes associated with particular accents.This and other Australian studies will be discussed further below.Learning to associate particular linguistic cues with ethnic categories may involve considerable learning, pointing to the social nature of the process.For example, Cairns (1982) has shown how children in Northern Ireland may take several years to learn to recognize names as cues to religious categorization.

Often this process of self- and other-categorization involves linguistic cues that may at first be rather confusing to the child, as this nice example from the study of Israeli families (McNamara 1987) mentioned above shows:

> My children when they came here they didn't know that they were Jewish... my boy asked me "I..I'm Jewish?" or in the synagogue when they were taken my little boy asked the Rabbi at the end... he put up his hand "Are you Jewish?"... the Rabbi!... and then I asked "Why did you ask the Rabbi that question?"He said "He couldn't speak Hebrew so I wasn't sure if he was Jewish or not... he spoke in English so how can I know?"He didn't quite connect the Rabbi with Judaism with everything... so they hadn't realized, being always in a Jewish community, taking for granted, you never think of it unless you see someone else that is not, so you know what you are... like looking in a mirror...

b) Social identity: It is not just that we learn to categorize our social experience in this way.We recognize ourselves as belonging or not belonging to valued categories which are salient in our particular social environment.This valuation of membership

categories may be internal (i.e. by members of the ingroup) or external (by outgroup members).The terms or "dimensions" in which this valuation is expressed are important, and will be discussed shortly.We thus become conscious of our *social identity* , and the degree to which it is positively or negatively valued.

c) Social comparison: Tajfel argues that we are constantly engaged in a competitive process of comparison of our own membership groups with other groups.The individual is involved in a search for ways in which s/he as a group member may feel positive about his or her sense of difference from members of other groups.In Tajfel's terms, the group members are looking for dimensions of comparison on which they can feel a sense of their own *positively valued psychological distinctiveness* .

The existing framework of social relations between groups will provide some dimensions on which comparisons can be made: power, wealth, status and so on. Other dimensions of comparison may be attributes such as intelligence, historical continuity, adherence to traditional family values, warmth, creativity, religious values and many others.

Language may itself be a dimension of comparison between groups; we may call this its status. The status of a language in the eyes of the ingroup, the internal status of the language, is discussed in Smolicz's work on "core values" (1979, 1984).This notion, it is worth pointing out, is somewhat problematic (cf. the discussion in Clyne 1988b, and in papers in Clyne 1985).

It is important here to distinguish between the *symbolic* and *communicative* functions of language (Clyne 1988b).While language may have value as symbolizing a group's identity, this does not necessarily mean that it will be valued as a communicative medium; this is true of modern Hebrew in the non-Israeli Jewish community in Australia (McNamara 1988b; Klarberg 1985).This distinction may also account for the fact that while there is no disputing Australian Poles' attachment to Polish, there has been considerable shift away from Polish relative to the shift from

other ethnic languages in Australia (Clyne 1988b).

In terms of external status, it is still the case, despite optimistic claims to the contrary (e.g. in Smolicz 1984), that immigrant languages in Australia have low external status, as measured by a recent study in Adelaide of tolerance for their use in public (details in Mackiewicz and Kee 1986; cf. also the discussion in McNamara 1988a). As far as English is concerned, its high status for both migrant and non-migrant groups in Australia is confirmed in several studies (see below).

It may be that on the basis of social comparison, a person or group may perceive their social identity negatively; that is, they may recognize that they belong to a group or group's membership which they do not value. The following strategies are available: *individual mobility*, whereby individuals may decide to "pass" into a more valued group (this is the assimilation option, very common in Australia; the shedding of a particular identity by an individual may involve the shedding of the linguistic identification markers of that identity, language being, as we have see above, a cue to social categorization); *social creativity*, where the terms of the intergroup comparison are stood on their head (the "black is beautiful" phenomenon); *outright social competition*, where there is an overt struggle to assert one's identity against that of a threatening outgroup (cf. Quebec, Belgium, for examples of situations involving language). More details of these strategies are available in Tajfel (1981).

The salience of ethnic identities: Obviously, one's specific ethnic identity is not going to be uniformly relevant in all social situations. And one's social identity is not only or perhaps mainly a question of one's ethnolinguistic identity. We are members of many more social groups than ethnolinguistic ones - gender, class, education level, age, etc. A number of factors may influence the salience of a particular ethnic group membership. Two of these are (Giles and Johnson 1981):

1. Situation: Tajfel (1981) refers to a continuum of social

behaviour, from inter-individual (a love affair, a chat over the back fence, where the ethnic identity of the individuals involved may not be salient) to intergroup (e.g. a race riot, where the social identity of those involved is the only thing that matters, and the individual characteristics of the outgroup members are irrelevant). By no means all of our contacts with people from different ethnic groups may thus be interpreted in intergroup terms.

2. Multiple group membership: Class, age, gender and occupation membership groups may be equally powerful or more powerful elements in defining an intergroup situation for an individual (cf. the discussion of Callan and Gallois 1982,and Callan, Gallois and Forbes 1983, below).

The more membership groups a person belongs to, and the less overlapping they are, the less likely that person is to perceive a situation in terms of a particular ethnic membership. In addition, the more of these membership groups are shared with another individual from a different ethnic group, the less relevant ethnic group membership is likely to be in an interaction with that individual.

In addition, different membership groups may provide differential status. A person may be likely to de-emphasize his/her membership of groups which offer low status (for example, a low-status ethnic group when interacting with a member of a higher status ethnic group) in favour of membership of groups (education, occupation) which offer greater status.

Individuals may also be members of more than one ethnically defined group: "Anglo-Saxon" and "Australian"; "Asian" and "Vietnamese"; "Israeli" and "Jewish" (McNamara 1988b); "Russian" and "Jewish" (Kouzmin 1988: see below). Often, there is a hierarchical relationship between the overlapping ethnically-related categorizations, so we may speak of group and subgroup. This issue is relevant to the work on the various migrant communities to be discussed later in this section. The categories "migrant" and "Italian", "Russian" etc. are also examples

of this superordinate/ subordinate multiplicity.Differing intergroup comparisons may make one or other of these potential social identities salient in a particular situation.

3.The transformation of social context: This factor, which is particularly relevant to the situation of immigrant languages, has been less widely discussed. As social categorizations determine social identity, social identity must be seen as context dependent.That is, particular social settings will differ from one another in the social groups that are present and salient, and in the relationships between those groups. Each intergroup context creates its own set of salient categories for intergroup comparison and the establishment of social identity.Social identity is thus dynamic, interactive and context-dependent.

This is particularly relevant to situations where the social context is radically transformed, for example in migration.In the act of immigration, immigrants are entering a new social context, in which their former social identity will have to be redefined; it may even be ultimately abandoned.And, as social identity changes, this is likely to have linguistic implications.As the group or the individual redefine their identity in a new intergroup context, their language attitudes and language behaviour may be expected to change as a result.

Examples of social identity theory applied to the shift to [illegible]

1.Israeli Jews in Melbourne: McNamara (1988b) used Social Identity Theory to explain the rapid shift in the direction of English monolingualism among the Australian-born children of Israeli native speakers of Hebrew living in Melbourne.This small group (approximately 1,000 families) illustrates the explanatory and predictive potential of aspects of the theory rather clearly.

The new social context in which the Israeli immigrants find themselves involves a dramatic shift in the available social categories.In interaction with the two most salient outgroups for

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

these families, Australian Jews and Gentiles, the following intergroup categorizations were salient:

a) Jewish vs Gentile (in interaction with Gentiles):In this interaction, a specifically Israeli identity is less significant.Gentiles are on the whole not very successful in making a distinction between "Jewish" and "Israeli", partly because the linguistic and other cues to categorization in specific "Israeli" terms are unavailable to most Gentiles.

b) Israeli vs Jewish Australian (in interaction with Australian Jews):In contrast to Gentiles, Australian Jews are able to recognize cues to categorization as "Israeli", a salient category in the Jewish community.

c) Israeli living permanently abroad ("Yordim") vs Israelis in Israel, or temporarily resident in Australia (in interaction with Australian Jews, or with other Israelis):Israelis living permanently abroad tend to be stigmatized by Israelis still in Israel, as having abandoned their country and their fellow citizens in time of crisis; this stigma tends to be internalized by the "yordim" themselves (see McNamara 1988b for further explanation of this pejorative term in Hebrew and its social and historical context).This syndrome of guilt at leaving the home country and moral criticism by those at home is a familiar phenomenon in several other cultures (cf British citizens leaving wartime Britain; Vietnamese, El Salvadoreans, and Chileans in Australia may display aspects of the same conflict).

d) Migrant vs native-born Anglo-Australian (in interaction with native-born Anglo-Australians).

Note that none of these categories are salient in Israel, where important categories include Israeli vs non-Israeli; religious (the minority) vs non-religious (the majority) - a distinction expressed (confusingly for Gentiles) by Israelis as "Jewish" vs "Israeli"; western Jewish ("Ashkenazi") vs eastern Jewish ("Sephardi"). Similarly, these *categories* may no longer be salient in Australia.

In interaction with both outgroups, the *multiple group*

membership of the Israelis - in particular their dual ethnic identities as Israelis and Jews - is a key to understanding the process of identity redefinition and its linguistic consequences in the new social context. The study confirmed that *in interaction with Gentiles*, Israelis felt they were perceived in terms of their general migrant origin, or, if specifically, in terms of their Jewishness. It is not really surprising that "Israeliness" is not a particularly salient category for Gentiles. The cues to such a categorization (recognition of a Hebrew accent, or of specifically Hebrew names) are not generally available to most Gentiles, whereas cues to categorization in terms of Jewish identity are well-known, and reinforced by conditioning which draws on a centuries-old tradition of Christian antagonism to Jews.

This fact of outgroup perception is a new experience for Israelis, who have had themselves no direct experience of Jewish minority existence in a Christian society. In fact, non-religious Israelis (the majority) are not necessarily used to seeing themselves as "Jewish" at all, a term *they use* to refer to Orthodox or Ultra-Orthodox Jews in Israel. One informant articulated this:

> The minute an Israeli leaves Israel, I believe he is a Jew... as far as the non-Jewish community is concerned. In Israel he can think as an Israeli but in the Diaspora he becomes a Jew whether he likes it or not.

The Israelis' direct or indirect experience of (infrequent but unmistakable) anti-Semitic incidents or remarks indicate clearly to them that categorization as "Jewish" is negatively evaluated by the outgroup. However it is not only, or perhaps even most importantly, such incidents or remarks which make Israelis aware of the salient categories in the new social context. The pervasiveness of Christian symbolism in mainstream Australian culture acts as a constant reminder to the Israelis of their Jewish "otherness".

The experience of the Israelis in the new social context, then, leads them to redefine themselves as members of three categories

stigmatized by more powerful outgroups: (a) migrants, non-native speakers of English; (b) Jews like other Diaspora Jews, a self categorization many would have rejected in Israel; (c) "yordim" (see above). Interactions with Australian Jews, too complex to discuss here, also lead them to redefine their identity in relation to that group, to stress their "Jewishness" and not their "Israeliness", which in the Australian context is associated with the stigmatized identity of the "yordim".

In order to deal with this sense of "negatively valued psychological distinctiveness", Israelis have the choice of retreat into their own Israeli, Hebrew-speaking group (social creativity), assimilation into the Australian Jewish group (a non-Hebrew speaking group which is increasingly monolingual English) or assimilation into the Gentile mainstream (again monolingual English). Barriers to the latter by Gentiles (what Giles and Johnson (1981) call "boundary hardness") mean that the second of these choices is the most likely, particularly for the children of the immigrants themselves.

The linguistic consequences of the new situation the Israelis find themselves in then are complex, but are likely to point in one direction: language shift to English. In terms of Hebrew as a migrant language in general, it is has already been pointed out above that migrant languages have low status in Australia. Majority group attitudes on this point are rapidly internalized by migrants themselves, as shown in the study by Mackiewicz and Kee (1986) mentioned above, and in the study by Callan and Gallois (1982) to be discussed below. To the extent that outgroup attitudes lead Israelis to redefine themselves as Jews in the Australian context, this may result in a commitment to the *symbolic* function of Hebrew (as an expression of support for Israel, and of traditional Jewish identity for ceremonial purposes) but not necessarily a commitment to the *communicative* functions of Hebrew (for the distinction, discussed above, cf Clyne 1988b). Being Jewish in Australia does not involve being able to

communicate in Hebrew.In common with other languages of immigrant groups in Australia, Hebrew has a lower status than English as a *vernacular* language in the Jewish community, despite its high symbolic status.

It is possible to see mainstream Jewish language attitudes as an internalization in turn of majority group (i.e. Gentile) attitudes. Similar phenomena in other communities, that is, the role of the local recipient ethnic community in the linguistic socialization of newcomers to the norms of the new society, have been little explored in relation to other immigrant groups and their languages. The local ethnic group may thus be seen as the agent of the majority group. The above analysis would suggest that a massive language shift (i.e. towards English monolingualism) is likely in the children of these Israeli families, and this is borne out by the evidence (see McNamara 1987, for details).

What we see here in microcosm is being repeated throughout tens of thousands of other immigrant families: the shedding of linguistic markers of stigmatized identities in favour of the mainstream monolingual norm.The relevant social categorizations will differ from group to group, but the process is essentially the same, eating away at the potential for individual bilingualism and multilingualism in our community

The studies that follow did not use Social Identity Theory as the framework for the research, but their findings can be usefully reinterpreted in terms of it.

2. Italian and Greek bilinguals: Two studies by social psychologists at the University of Queensland provide examples of multiple group membership effects not discussed so far. Callan and Gallois (1982) found that the sex of their bilingual Italian and Greek Australian subjects made a difference in the evaluation of matched guises.(Matched guise studies involve bilingual informants making value judgements, including attributions of personality traits, evaluations of social status, etc, in relation to individuals they hear speaking on tape in one of two or more

languages; the subjects are unaware that fluent bilinguals are taking roles in either language alternately, *i.e.* adopting language "guises"). Female subjects were found to be more favourable than their male counterparts to English guises, and less favourable towards Italian and Greek guises. In a further study (Callan, Gallois and Forbes 1983), Greek-Australian females rated Greek-accented English more negatively than their male counterparts. The authors comment:

> Our results highlight the importance of sex role in any theory of ethnolinguistic vitality. Women in upwardly mobile minority groups, so far, appear to threaten the maintenance of their minority language by downgrading it, and to lead their children into adopting the majority speech style. It is possible, however, that this tendency is greater in communities where the status of women is lower in the minority group than in the majority group. (Callan, Gallois and Forbes 1983:423)

This finding can be explained in terms of multiple group membership. In this case, ethnic identity is associated with a more restrictive female role. The opportunities for the female as a female are greater in the outgroup, and this affects her evaluation of her own ethnic group and the ethnic outgroup.

The earlier of these studies has been criticized on linguistic grounds (Pauwels 1986a). Subjects were asked to evaluate Standard Italian guises, and as this variety is not represented in the Australian speech community, the findings must be inconclusive.

3. The Dutch community: Pauwels (1986b, 1988) reports on the maintenance of the Limburgs dialect of Dutch and standard Dutch among Limburgers from South Holland in Australia. She notes the use of English by Limburgs speakers when addressing speakers of standard Dutch in Australia even though the dialect speakers would normally use standard Dutch in such interactions in Holland, and are capable of using the standard in Australia if they wanted to. Brabant speakers (who come from a neighbouring

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

area) do not display such behaviour, nor do Swabians from Germany in interaction in Australia with other Germans. These examples can be accounted for in social identity terms, and illustrate the concepts of multiple group membership and the strategy of social creativity. The Limburgers in Australia are both Limburgers and Australian. In interaction with mainstream Dutch speakers, Limburgers use the language that asserts their higher status identity (Australian citizen). They are also denying the standard speakers the right to impose their variety as the language of intergroup communication; this is "creative" behaviour in intergroup terms, and reveals the underlying group tension which may have been less apparent, linguistically speaking, in the Dutch context. In fact, it seems there is a history of tension between the Limburgers and the mainstream in Holland which is not present, for example, for Swabians vis-a-vis mainstream Germans in the German context. The Brabant speakers, occupying a geographical buffer zone between the Limburgers and the powerful northerners, have adopted a policy of accommodating to the powerful group. It is interesting to see the consequences of this situation being played out in the new context of Australia, which allows the Limburgers to turn the tables linguistically on the majority Dutch.

In another study, Pauwels (1986a) reports on the attitudes of Dutch immigrants to three speech samples characteristic of the Dutch-Australian community:

a) Standard Dutch with a regional accent, almost transfer-free

b) Dutch characterized by transfers, and code-switching

c) unlimited switching between English and Dutch with a Dutch phonic pattern.

While the informants identified with and accepted the second guise, they refused to identify with or accept the third guise. Pauwels comments:

> These informants seem more concerned with the linguistic

> quality of their English than that of their Dutch since they refuse to identify with the third guise. Is this a reflection of their linguistic pragmatism, or does it reflect the pride they take in being credited by the dominant group with the status of the most proficient users of English among the immigrant groups of non-English speaking background? (Pauwels 1986a:14)

The themes of this comment - the intergroup context of a single powerful outgroup and a "pecking order" of minority groups; the strategy of coping with minority status by associating with majority values in order to win superiority over other minority groups; the linguistic implications of this, i.e. the higher status of the outgroup language and the neglect of the ingroup one; the attempt to win acceptance in the valuation of the outgroup - all these themes are easily explicable in social identity terms.

4. Italians in Sydney: Bettoni and Gibbons (1988) comment that the shift to English among Italians in Australia is much more rapid than one might expect given the demography of the Italian community. For example, Italians are more numerous than Greeks in Australia, yet the language is maintained less well. They hypothesize that the relative strength of demographic factors is weakened by the fact that few, if any, Italians in Australia speak Standard Italian, that their cohesion is threatened by the existence of numerous dialects and regional or popular varieties, and that their attitudes towards these non-standard varieties are mostly negative.

The informants in the study were asked to evaluate the following varieties:

a) two dialects (Sicilian, Venetian)

b) two forms (Sicilian, Venetian) of Regional Italian (i.e. Italian spoken with a heavy regional accent)

c) two "light mixtures" of Regional Italian with a few lexical transfers from English well integrated phonologically

d) two "heavy mixtures" based on dialects and Popular Italian

with numerous longer English elements pronounced with an Australian accent

e) English.

The evaluations were made using a version of the matched guise technique.

Briefly, both the dialects and the mixtures were negatively evaluated, while (Regional) Italian and English were highly evaluated. Most Italian immigrants in Australia speak dialect or one of the mixtures; Regional Italian is "the least spontaneous of the Italo-Australian varieties", according to Bettoni and Gibbons.

From the perspective of this paper, the following details of the study are of interest:

a) The evaluations of dialect and Regional forms do not match evaluations discovered in related studies in Italy. Social identity theory would explain this in terms of the changed intergroup context in Australia. In particular, dialects are more stigmatized:

> Dialects in Italy rate favourably on personality traits such as "likeability" and "reliability", and even when they are not favoured they are never heavily stigmatized... This is in contrast with the Australian results, which on a wider range of traits and to a greater extent condemn the dialects.

Bettoni and Gibbons offer the following explanation:

> In Italy Dialects are more positively valued because they are more widely used by people of all socioeconomic classes, whereas after migration they become restricted languages shared only by other low-status immigrants of the same narrow geographical origin.

b) The Dialects are more strongly seen as marking ethnicity in this study than the Regional Italian, even though (or perhaps as a result of which) attitudes towards them are more negative than to the Regional Italian. Social Identity Theory would say that as the ethnic identity is stigmatized in the Australian context, so should the linguistic marker of that identity be.

c) The disapproval of the heavy mixture variety may be

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

explained in exactly the same terms as those used by Pauwels to explain the Dutch intolerance of a heavy mixture and relative tolerance of a light mixture, i.e. that there is more concern over English spoken badly than over Italian spoken badly.

d)There is at least one dimension on which, in terms of social comparison, the Italian immigrants can achieve a clear positive distinctiveness: Italian is the language of a great culture.Bettoni and Gibbons offer this as the explanation for the high regard given to (Regional) Italian, even though it is the least "spontaneous" variety for this group.They summarize their findings as follows:

> Linguistically Italians value their past in a highly selective way which does not include the narrow confines of either their original Italian town, or their ethnic group in Australia.

This is a further example of the importance of the symbolic rather than the communicative function of a language in social identity terms.There is an interesting comparison here with the role of Hebrew in the Jewish community.

5. Russians in Sydney and Melbourne: Kouzmin (1988) reports on language attitudes in two Russian communities in Melbourne and Sydney.The two communities are a post-Second World War second wave and a post-1974 third wave.The groups are rather different in that the third wave are overwhelmingly Soviet Jews.The absence of a symbolic function for Russian for the third wave immigrants, and the instrumental nature of their support for Russian language maintenance, lead Kouzmin to conclude that for this group their will be no maintenance of Russian beyond the second generation.

One difference between the groups is the multiple ethnic identity of the third wave group.It is likely that jngroup and outgroup perceptions of the type outlined above in the Israeli study reinforce the self-perception of the third wave in terms of their Jewishness, rather than their Russianess, thus strengthening their links with the non-Russian speaking Jewish community.It may also be that because, as Kouzmin points out,

Russian symbolizes majority religious and cultural traditions, Russian Jews, who may have had a painful experience of the intergroup context in the Soviet Union, feel some ambivalence about these symbols in the Australian context."Ambivalence" is I think the right word, as Jews are typically divided on such issues; this is expressed in some of the comments Kouzmin quotes, which reveal a split in opinion among Soviet Jews in Australia on the issue of Russian language maintenance.In terms of intergroup perceptions and the effect of context on social identity, the following remark from one of Kouzmin's informants is interesting:

> "...while living in Russia, we weren't allowed to forget that we were Jews, and here we've suddenly become Russians."

It is not clear in whose eyes this is: other members of the Jewish community, or the majority society?If the latter, such a perception might conceivably lead to allegiance to Russian, if the intergroup boundary is "hard"; but a more likely outcome is that it will lead individuals to stress shared membership of their other ethnic membership group (the Jewish one), particularly as the Jewish/Gentile intergroup boundary is likely to be relatively "hard".Kouzmin herself comments as follows on this quote:

> The discussion around the question "Russian or Jew" is an example of how perceptions of identity can alter with context.It also highlights the problem of interpreting core values, including the place of language, for a community as a whole, given that it is possible for members to have multiple loyalties.

6.Aboriginal creole-speaking communities: Work by Shnukal (1983, 1985), Sandefur (1985) and Harris (1986, 1988)traces the painful history of the origins of Australian creoles in the context of violent, even brutal intergroup contact.Australia has two creoles: Torres Strait Creole, spoken on islands in the Torres Strait, north of Australia, and Kriol, spoken in northern and north-western Australia.The development of the creoles is associated with the arrival of missionaries, who were seen as

offering protection and relief from an earlier period of violent attack and exploitation; in the case of the mainland Roper River mission, the period before the establishment of the mission in 1908 had been a particularly appalling one, with parties of Europeans actually hunting Aborigines to kill them. As far as the Torres Strait situation is concerned, Shnukal (1983:176) comments:

> Thus when the London Missionary Society sought to place South Sea Island teachers on... the islands [in] 1871... the Torres Strait Islanders agreed, although reluctantly. After all, the LMS teachers were under white protection; their presence provided a curb on exploitation; and they offered in exchange to teach the Islanders the ways and language of the Europeans. The arrival of the LMS is still referred to as the "Coming of the Light", and celebrated each year on 1 July as the Torres Strait National Day.

The South Sea Islanders were in fact of mixed European and South Sea Island descent, and as *apkas* ("half-castes") were highly regarded because of their light skins and straight hair, particularly as marriage partners. They settled in considerable numbers on one of the islands, were figures of privilege and status, and were seen as accessible intermediaries between the Torres Strait Islanders and the Europeans. The situation is almost a textbook example of the processes of social categorization and social comparison.

The linguistic consequences of the situation were profound, above all because, even though the South Sea Islanders themselves spoke a pidgin in interaction with Europeans, they were believed to be speakers of English, as they were seen communicating with English speakers. Thus the pidgin and subsequent creole were believed to be English, a fact which gave them powerful status. The creole came to replace the Torres Strait Island languages, which were stigmatized as belonging to the "'dark, uncivilised' past and as inappropriate to the new society being created" (Shnukal

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1985:231). At Roper River, the creole was formed in dormitories of children living on the mission, in many cases children who had been forcibly taken from their parents or whose parents had been murdered. The children embraced the new creole with enthusiasm and pride, and rejoiced in their new identity as the children of the mission. This was a conversion in more than a religious sense.

The formation of the Australian creoles is a powerful example of a phenomenon that Tajfel has described, "the internalization by members of minorities of the 'outside' views about them" (Tajfel 1981:234). The more violent is the oppression, the stronger may be the impulse to identify with the oppressor as a mechanism for coping with the situation.

Conclusions : The analysis in this section may make one pessimistic about the chances for enduring multilingualism in Australia. Efforts should be directed at the Anglo-Celtic majority as much as at ethnolinguistic minorities to improve the chances of minority language survival. For example, admired mainstream figures who have bilingual competence can be highlighted. We need a Bob Hawke who can speak a language other than English well, and who is admired for it. If the mainstream can come to see bilingualism if not the norm, then at least a possible way of being "Australian" in a typical or mainstream sense, this will ease the pressure on bilingual communities and give them some space in which to cultivate their bilingual resources for their own and the community's benefit.

Suggestions for Recommendations

The preceding discussion has shown that bilingualism is not in any way detrimental to children's linguistic or cognitive development. For their emotional development, particularly for their relationship with their parents, speaking the parents' language at home might be mandatory in some cases. Reasons for the high rates of school failure among bilingual children, as observed in

many countries, must be sought in socio-economic and cultural differences between the immigrant group and the ruling class in the host society.

In the light of the research findings presented in the preceding sections, parents should be encouraged to communicate with their children in the language they feel most comfortable with and in which they are most likely to present their children with the best quality of interaction in terms of sustained interaction, shared play and introduction to their own way of thinking. Use of an unfamiliar language may dwarf the verbal interaction in the family and estrange parents and children.

Parents should be urged to be consistent in their language choice in order to facilitate the acquisition of the two languages as independent systems. A rich and varied input in the minority language is important for the development of sophisticated language skills which will lead to cognitive benefits for the bilingual child. Parents should be given advice and assistance in the accomplishment of this.

Being informed about the course of bilingual development, the range of linguistic behaviour to be considered normal and the cognitive advantages of high levels of bilingualism, will help parents to have faith in their children's ability to master the linguistic challenge. It will also enable them to cope with uninformed advice and criticism.

Since the ability to appreciate decontextualized language is central to the Australian school system, it is necessary that parents realize the importance of reading books to their children. Children are never too young or too old to be read to. Unfortunately, even among parents who in principal believe in reading to their children, reading activities are often limited to the pre-school and early primary school years. Under two years of age children are often thought to be too young to appreciate books, and once they can read themselves many parents consider it unnecessary to read to them any longer. Book sharing is the more important in

a minority language in order to ensure the development of high levels of language aptitude inspite of restricted input and a limited set of experiences.

The community should take steps to support parents in raising their children bilingually as well as in preparing them for life in a society based on literacy. This can be done through:

- libraries providing pre-school story books in languages other than English;

- health workers and social workers counselling parents or other caregivers to read books to children from a very young age on;

- literacy classes for adults which do not only teach how to read and write but also transmit the importance of literacy in our society and urge parents to read to their children;

- professionally guided playgroups which help NESB parents to acquire skills in how to read and play with children and knowledge about pre-school materials customarily used in Anglo middle class families (books, puzzles, board games, arts and crafts materials, etc) as well as provide a forum for parents for exchange of experience and incidental learning;

- Cummins suggests L1 education while BICS in L2 are developing through peer interaction, in order not to allow a gap in academic achievement to develop in early school years. This is in agreement with the UNESCO recommendations of 30 years ago. General academic proficiency will easily be transferred from L1 to L2, due to interdependence of cognitive development.

Parents should be aware of the immense pressures against bilingualism in the community, and realize that conscious effort and intervention are called for. Bilingualism is not a natural outcome of social forces in Australian society at present. In particular, monolingual English-speaking families need to be made aware of the personal and social benefits of language knowledge, and efforts should be directed at highlighting second language competencies in Australians known to appeal to the

Australian mainstream whenever they occur.

The following books can be recommended to parents and professionals for further reading:

Arnberg, L. (1987) *Raising Children Bilingually: The Preschool Years* . Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

de Jong, E. (1986) *The Bilingual Experience*. Cambridge: C.U.P.

Harding, E. and P. Riley (1986) *The Bilingual Family : A Handbook for Parents.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Saunders, G. (1988) *Bilingual Children: From Birth to Teens.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

Trelease, J. (1986): *The Read-Aloud Handbook.* Richmond, Vic.: Penguin

Wells, G. (1986) *The Meaning Makers.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann

Much recommended is *The Bilingual Family Newsletter*, edited by George Saunders. This Newsletter is published by Multilingual Matters and appears four times a year. It provides a forum for the exchange of experiences bilingual families have as well as expert advice.